

Summary of Public Scoping Comments  
Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary  
Environmental Review Process to Consider Marine Reserves

The Sanctuary received both written and verbal comments during the public scoping period from May 22 – July 23, 2003. Comments were solicited at the following public meetings -

June 5 in Pt. Hueneme  
June 12 in Santa Barbara  
June 16-20 in Foster City, Pacific Fishery Management Council  
June 26 in Santa Barbara, Conservation Working Group, SAC  
July 15 in Carpinteria, Business Working Group, SAC  
July 18 in Ventura, Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC)

**Major constituencies represented and providing comments -**

Sanctuary Advisory Council members, alternates and working group members  
Pacific Fishery Management Council subpanel and committee members  
Recreational fishing organizations and individuals  
Commercial Fishing organizations and individuals  
Environmental organizations and individuals  
Congresswoman Capps' office  
State and Federal Agencies  
General Public

The following summary illustrates the range of public comment received -

- Expand marine reserve areas to complete a scientifically based network to include the variety of habitats, depth ranges and species with connectivity between reserves
- Existing fisheries management is working, do not expand State Marine Protected Areas
- Consider impacts of pollution, oil slicks, sewage, nuclear/toxic waste
- Allow pelagics to be harvested recreationally from zoned areas
- Protect pelagics in zoned areas
- Reserves provide heritage and intrinsic values, consider value to general public
- Demonstrate administrative and monitoring capabilities before considering expansion
- Consider marine parks that allow recreational fishing to test impacts of recreational fishing
- Consider broad range of alternatives and management tools, not just reserves
- Ensure management actions are enforceable/provide adequate enforcement
- Need to fund socioeconomic effects to understand fishery impacts
- Support experimental/adaptive approach
- Consider birds and marine mammals

**Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC) Comments**

The following is a subset of SAC comments.

- Utilize the Marine Reserves Working Group work and address areas of consensus and non-consensus. Build on the existing State environmental process documents and information

- Clearly define the purpose and need for considering additional marine reserves
- Keep the marine reserves and management plan NEPA processes separate. Time is of the essence; given four years of community process it is critical to move forward
- Reserve size will determine the scale and timing of effects, i.e. small reserves will have a smaller effect and take longer to realize versus larger reserves
- Consider the costs and benefits of phasing to the resources and economy over time.
- Describe the agency's commitment and processes toward long-term management.
- Consider the socioeconomic effects of the groundfish closures
- Recreational fishing impacts on resources need to be considered
- Analyze positive and negative impacts to consumptive and non-consumptive users
- Establish socioeconomic impact thresholds of significance (as required by NEPA).
- The Sanctuary is encouraged to work with agency partners and the PFMC
- The recommendation chosen by the State was developed jointly by the California DFG and the Sanctuary and should be one of the alternatives considered

#### Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) comments

Sanctuary staff met with the PFMC, Habitat Advisory Panel, California Delegation, Science and Statistical Committee (SSC), Enforcement Advisory Group and the Groundfish Advisory Panel (GAP). The Habitat, SSC, GAP and Enforcement groups submitted written statements that have been forwarded with the PFMC Statement.

#### ***Planning for Federal Waters Portion of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary***

*"The Council directed staff to forward all prepared statements of its advisory bodies on the topic of marine reserves in the CINMS, as well as the April 24 letter from the Council to CINMS, as formal scoping comments to the CINMS. In addition, the Council directed that its Ad Hoc Marine Reserves Committee meet to review the CINMS preliminary draft environmental document, the draft CINMS management plan, and a summary of scoping comments provided by CINMS, and to provide recommendations to the Council as appropriate. Finally, the Council directed the chair of the SSC Marine Reserves Subcommittee to work with CINMS staff on providing clarification of earlier SSC comments on CINMS environmental documents. " (PFMC Website)*

#### General comments from the PFMC sub-panels and committees-

- The State Environmental Documents are inadequate
- Clarify the processes to revise the CINMS Management Plan, amend the Designation Document and consider marine reserves under the National Marine Sanctuaries Act
- Concern that CINMS is usurping fisheries management
- The CINMS public process and SAC representation is unfair (i.e. no recreational fishing rep)